

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DIANNE NELSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-04-1103 DFL KJM PS

vs.

PLACER COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Pending before the court is plaintiff's motion to strike defendants' initial disclosures, as well as plaintiff's motion to file a second amended complaint and to supplement plaintiff's initial disclosure. As provided by Local Rule 78-230(h), the court submitted the matter on the papers without oral argument.<sup>1</sup> Upon review of the motion and the documents in support and opposition, and good cause appearing therefor, THE COURT FINDS AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Defendants' initial disclosures were timely. The motion to strike is denied.

////

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> The July 12, 2005 order submitting on the papers plaintiff's motions filed June 6, 2005 also referred to plaintiff's motion filed June 27, 2005. That motion, however, was previously vacated by order filed June 29, 2005. The instant order therefore will address only the merits of the motions filed June 6, 2005.

1           2. Plaintiff is granted leave to file a second amended complaint within thirty days  
2 from the date of this order. Amendment shall be limited to correction of typographical errors as  
3 identified in plaintiff's motion to amend.

4           3. Plaintiff may supplement initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil  
5 Procedure 26(e) without leave of court.

6 DATED: July 19, 2005.

7  
8   
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

006  
nelson.mts